TO :

FROM :

SUBJECT: Special Conference of August 1, 1951

On August 6, 1951, [redacted] the writer with [redacted] attended a special conference at [redacted] between 3:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. In addition to those mentioned above, there were present [redacted] (proposed Director concurrence), a close working associate [redacted].

[redacted] and the writer attended this conference at the invitation [redacted] on the belief that the conference was to have been a report on polygraph operations on [redacted] and been very useful for. This, however, was not the case. The details follow:

[redacted] opened the conference by stating that he had been in charge of a project in [redacted] in which the [redacted] had used a polygraph operator along with a team of psychiatrists and psychologists on [redacted]. stated that he had had for many years an interest in the use of the polygraph but that this recent [redacted] experience had demonstrated again to him that there was a wide division regarding the efficacy of the polygraph between the polygraph operators themselves and individuals who looked at the polygraph from a "scientific" point of view. He stated that he was amazed to find at that the psychiatrists and psychologists on this [redacted] project did not agree with the polygraph operator as to whether or not the polygraph was effective - the polygraph operator maintaining that the polygraph was very effective and the psychiatrists and psychologists stating that it was much more less effective and that it was not useful in many ways for certain types of work. [redacted] also stated that he had found this to be universally true that polygraph operators stated that the machine was very effective and that scientists or doctors felt that it was less effective than the professionals thought it was. He stated therefore that he wanted to talk to the members of the conference and (1) get their opinions as to the machine's effectiveness and (2) to get in motion a project which [redacted] could handle to deliberately study and evaluate the effectiveness of the polygraph. He stated that this could be done by [redacted] probably through [redacted].

[redacted] pointed out, as did [redacted] to the writer, that they were in attendance at the conference under the understanding that the conference was to be a report on certain polygraph operations by [redacted] and that they could not commit themselves to policy since as far as CIA was concerned. However, since their presence was official and since the conference itself was of individuals of high security clearance [redacted] cooperated fully in discussions, particularly [redacted] both having technical knowledge of the polygraph.

[redacted]

early in the conference [redacted] disclosed a polygraph chart which he said had been run on him and which consisted of the standard card test. Pertaining this, in a conversation, [redacted] admitted that all [redacted] employees were being run by [redacted] on the polygraph on a loyalty test apparently identical with that used at [redacted] and apparently on a contract basis at so much per head. [redacted] appears is quite favorably impressed by [redacted] method and is in no way familiar with the more complicated and subtle [redacted] techniques.

[redacted] (who arrived approximately one hour after the conference began) pointed out that he has little technical knowledge of the polygraph itself but because of his work on various committees he had been requested to look into this type of thing and he expressed himself to the effect that he had great interest in the polygraph or any other devices having to do with the detection of deception. [redacted] apparently was familiar with the [redacted] and with projects that were having to do with machines for securing deception.

[redacted] who was introduced into the conference by [redacted] had no knowledge of the polygraph, having never seen one or having any idea of its operation thereof. As a result, considerable time was devoted to explaining technical details of the operation of the polygraph to [redacted] and to a certain extent to [redacted] The conference developed that [redacted] had recently come aboard [redacted] and that at present he was cleared at [redacted] for "secret" clearance although apparently known personally both to [redacted] According to [redacted] is to head up an [redacted] project which is to be known as [redacted] and part of the task of this [redacted] staff will be to study reports and design for the [redacted] [redacted] stated that he could see no reason why the study of the polygraph and its effectiveness could not be brought under the project [redacted] and he would specifically assign [redacted] to such work.

In the general discussion involving the polygraph, it became obvious to [redacted] were not thoroughly background in the use of the polygraph nor did they understand its application in so far as CIA was concerned nor were they aware of our involvement of the polygraph in various courts and that their approach to the whole situation was more on a scientific level than at the operations level. [redacted] to some extent, were curious about any statistics available concerning the effectiveness of the polygraph and whether or not statistics that might be available were "valid" from a scientific point of view. They were also very curious about the training of operators, the personal elements about the use of the polygraph, whether or not the tester, rather than the test effective in the field and other related items. [redacted] appeared more receptive or best possible scientific statistics that had been set forth in reference books such as [redacted] pointed out that there certain analyses of [redacted] scores of polygraph charts had been made, scientific statistical charts by trained individuals had never been made owing to a lack [illegible] and a lack of time. [redacted] also pointed out that the top security officials of CIA regarded the polygraph work as highly effective but this was, of

[redacted]

[redacted] A
course, solely from a security point of view. [redacted] expressed the opinion that CIA should sponsor one or more studies [redacted] additional studies on the evaluation of the polygraph if such coverage would be of value.

It was necessary [redacted] A
out that there is a vast amount of difference between using a polygraph on a security reason and examining it from a scientific point of view or to infallibility, etc.

The conference involved some discussion concerning other devices of detection of deception such as instruments [illegible] the [illegible] of the eye, the electro-encephalograph and some sonic-audio devices.

In the opinion of both [redacted] A
primary of an exploratory nature and was not a conference at all and originally scheduled as a general meeting between [redacted] C
responsibilities of [redacted] G
and related devices for the benefit of the [redacted] H
pointed out that [redacted] and hence, CIA interests he could not commit himself as to specific CIA interest in the matter and suggested that [redacted] C
ence at a future date with [redacted] personally. This [redacted] agreed to do. All hands agreed that it would probably be beneficial to have [redacted] make an independent study of these matters. Both [redacted] pointed out that CIA security was at all times interested in obtaining the best possible devices in these fields and that any improvements or corrections along these lines would be most welcome and that CIA security itself conducts an [illegible] research to increase the effectiveness of their own polygraph techniques and polygraph devices.

The conference ended with the agreement that [redacted] would support C
interest in getting [illegible] such a project and in order to do so would talk with G
[redacted] and recommend that [redacted] be given authority to set up and activate such a project. [redacted] also agreed to talk to [redacted] concerning CIA interests in these matters.

For a matter of record during the discussion of the effectiveness of the polygraph and whether or not the polygraph could be "beaten", [redacted] C
wanted to know if any tests had been made concerning the use of hypnosis and/or narcotics both in connection with the polygraph and in connection with their general use for interrogation purposes. Since the writer is specifically working on such a project he agreed [redacted] some conversation along these lines but specific details were withheld in this connection since the writer had no certain knowledge as to the extent that [redacted] had been launched into the [illegible] project. Further, it is not known from the nature of the conversation whether [redacted] discussion [illegible] or whether his remarks in this connection were of a general nature only. The writer merely pointed out to [redacted] that CIA security, of course, had an interest in such matters and was cognizant of the uses of such drugs as sodium amytal, scopolamine, etc. and that

[redacted]

[redacted]

- 4 -

research was being carried on in several areas from a security point of view along these lines. It was also pointed out at this time to [redacted] that because of extremely severe security measures in connection with these matters that discussions along these lines was hampered. The writer stated that he hoped in the near future under different circumstances to be able to discuss such matters with [redacted] officially since [redacted] showed a rather keen interest in this direction. C

CLOSE OUT: In the opinion of the writer and [redacted] our representation at this conference was unnecessary. A great deal of time was wasted in explaining elementary things and in academic discussions of the nature of the polygraph which had no bearing on [redacted], security matters or other elements mentioned above. [redacted] specifically pointed out that policy matters involving the use of the polygraph came from higher authority and that their only concern was in the specific operation in the use of that instrument. Both [redacted] held the position that the polygraph as used by Security CIA is a very effective weapon from a security point of view. Both [redacted] however, clearly stated that CIA security was always interested in more effective instruments if such could be designed or any new devices or any new methods that could be introduced in the detection of deception. A

A [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

20 [illegible]

A/B, III, 7, 5

[illegible]

SUBJECT: Meeting

Place: Office of [redacted] C
Time: 2:30 P.M. [illegible]
Present: [redacted] A

1. [redacted] started the meeting by stating he had called it to discuss the polygraph as a valid device for detecting deception. He had encountered a great faith in it on the part of operators and a great skepticism on the part of well trained psychologists who were not active in using it. C

2. [redacted] then discussed a book on lie detection by [redacted] which states that experience has shown that a trained operator using a polygraph can determine the nature of the deception being practiced in 95% of the more usual deception crimes. The training will include the 5% of persons encountered by police who have no response to the polygraph indicators. [redacted] stated that in running several thousand cases they have never encountered such a person. A,C A

3. [redacted] stated that evaluation of the polygraph requires answers to the following questions: C

a. Have any studies been made as to its reliability in measuring the responses it is supposed to measure?

b. What limitations exist? - The machine measures stress, but when do we stop getting pure stress responses. Studies have shown that fatigue responses are often confused with stress responses. Designers of any new device will have to keep portability in mind. The 65-50# of the present Keeler equipment is probably an upper weight limit.

c. Why is there such a difference in opinion as to the reliability of the polygraph? (referred to above)

d. Has any study scientifically evaluated one polygraph against another?

e. Has any one established a standardized degree of training for polygraph operators?

[redacted]

f. If the instrument is a valid indicator, how can it increase the legal acceptance in civil courts of its findings? - The [redacted] is finding it such a good investigative tool that it is [redacted] a large number of questions al[redacted] H

b. [redacted] raised the question as to whether or not the polygraph could be used as a means of measuring intelligence due to its detecting responses. C

5. [redacted] stated he felt any project that would be developed could be related to the one now under way for the [redacted] in which there is a basic study of the biochemistry of fatigue. Our interest in deception could be pin-pointed to the biochemical response of the nerves to stress. He stated that he knew [redacted] was interested in both these areas. C, H, G

6. The encephalograph was mentioned. It was [redacted] probably would not be using it as [redacted] are making a very thorough investigation of it at present. There is some work now being done at [redacted] on the device, but under whose sponsorship it was not known. C

7. Various related activities were mentioned as follows:

a. [redacted] has been interested for some years in a device for determining nervous stress by measuring blood flow. He has expressed interest in the detection of deception. C

b. There is a medical clinic in [redacted] which is specializing in the use of hypnosis in the treatment of nervous disorders. H

c. [redacted] mentioned a new drug called "Metanil" which is better than scopolamine at making persons talk freely. C

d. The existence of [redacted] was mentioned. [redacted] C

8. In conclusion, it was decided that:

a. A complete and scientific investigation of all polygraphs is in order. This should:

(1) Determine the best available

(2) Determine how it could be improved

b. [redacted] such an investigation is most appropriately within the scope of [redacted] and should be a part of the [redacted] which [redacted] is to give [redacted] in the near future. C, H, G

c. [redacted] who is now a consultant for [redacted] on other matters will speak to [redacted] about expediting the assignment of the polygraph investigation project to [redacted]. C, H, G

[redacted] A